

LAW OFFICES
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
3200 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 19 2005

Telephone
404-653-6400

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

Facsimile
404-653-6444

DATE October 19, 2005

TO

Firm: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office **Fax No.:** 571-273-8300

FROM

Name: Robert C. Stanley **Phone No.:** 404-653-6441
Fax # Verified by: add **# Pages (incl. this):** 4

Confirmation Copy to Follow: No

SUBJECT

In re Application of: Hung L. CHOU et al.
Application Serial No. 10/676,017
Filed: October 2, 2003
For: PAPER PRODUCTS INCLUDING SURFACE TREATED THERMALLY
BONDABLE FIBERS AND METHODS OF MAKING THE SAME
Attorney Docket No. 02734.0517-00000

MESSAGE

Please deliver the attached letter. Thank you!

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office on October 19, 2005.

By: 
Robert C. Stanley, Reg. No. 55,830

Enclosed: Response to Restriction Requirement (3 Pages)

If there is a problem with this transmission, notify fax room at (404) 653-6462 or the sender at the number above.

This facsimile is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message by first-class mail to the above address.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**OCT 19 2005****PATENT**

Customer No. 22,852

Attorney Docket No. 02734.0517-00000

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Hung L. CHOU et al.

Application No.: 10/676,017

Filed: October 2, 2003

For: PAPER PRODUCTS INCLUDING
SURFACE TREATED THERMALLY
BONDABLE FIBERS AND METHODS OF
MAKING THE SAME)
)
) Group Art Unit: 1731
)
) Examiner: Dennis R. CORDRAY
)
)
) Confirmation No.: 6440
)
)**MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

VIA FACSIMILE

571-273-8300

Sir:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

This communication responds to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005 ("Restriction Requirement"). Claims 1-230 are currently pending in this application. The Office has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to one of the following three groups of inventions:

- Group I - Claims 1-118, 154-167, and 208-230, drawn to products, classified in class 428.
- Group II - Claims 119-153 and 168-194, drawn to a method, classified in class 162, subclass 157.3.
- Group III - Claims 195-207, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 162, subclass 298.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT
Application Serial No. 10/676,017
Attorney Docket No. 02734.0517-00000

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, to prosecute the subject matter embodied in the claims of Group II (claims 119-153 and 168-194).

Regarding Applicant's traverse of the restriction requirement, MPEP § 803 sets forth the two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction: (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner. Applicants submit that the search and examination of Groups I, II, and III can be made without serious burden in this application. For example, the search required for the subject matter in each of Groups I, II, and III would inevitably overlap at least partially as each independent claim in each Group recites, *inter alia*, a thermally bondable fiber exhibiting hydrophilicity. As such, a proper search of any of the three Groups would have to include a search for such a fiber. That overlap in the scope of the search reveals that a substantial burden on the Examiner would not exist to examine all of Groups I, II, and III in this application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement between Groups I, II, and III be withdrawn.

Applicants further traverse the restriction requirement between Groups II and III due to the lack of any serious burden on the Examiner to consider both Groups in this application. Proper searches and examination of the Group II claims, provisionally elected in this paper, would have to overlap that of Group III at least to some extent because the Office has indicated that both Groups II and III are classified in class 162, regardless of the particular subclass. Therefore, no serious burden can exist on the Examiner to consider the claims of at least Groups II and III in the same application.

Applicants have provisionally elected, with traverse, to prosecute the subject matter of Group II, as currently embodied in claims 119-153 and 168-194. For at least

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT
Application Serial No. 10/676,017
Attorney Docket No. 02734.0517-00000

the reasons stated above, however, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement and request that it be withdrawn such that all of pending claims 1-230 be examined during prosecution of this application.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 19, 2005

By:



Robert C. Stanley
Reg. No. 53,830